



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,629	05/09/2007	Jean-Paul Louvel	PDO40021	6100
24498	7590	11/19/2008		
Joseph J. Laks			EXAMINER	
Thomson Licensing LLC			CLARK, CHRISTOPHER JAY	
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations				
PO Box 5312			ART UNIT	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543			2836	
			MAIL DATE	
			11/19/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/586,629

Applicant(s)

LOUVEL ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER J. CLARK

Art Unit

2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/19/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 19, 2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The language of the claim is confusing. The claim portrays the limitation that the microprocessor is responsible for switching on the picture display device, which is not discussed in the applicant's disclosure. The examiner feels there is an error of clarity present in this claim. The expedite examination, the examiner will attempt to address the claim as best as possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Woo et al (2004/0179321).

7. In re Claim 1, Woo teaches a circuit arrangement for degaussing a picture tube as seen in Figure 1 comprising:

- A degaussing coil (160)
- A single PTC element (151)
- A switch (140)
- Wherein said degaussing coil, PTC, and switch are arranged in series for providing degaussing by activation of said switch for a defined time interval (Paragraphs 34 and 35)

8. In re Claim 3, Woo teaches that the time interval is a value of 1 to 20 seconds (Paragraph 35).

9. In re Claim 4, Woo teaches that the switch is a relay (140) having a mains isolation with the control contacts being coupled to a microprocessor (130) for control by the microprocessor (paragraph 35).

10. In re Claim 7, Woo teaches that it is desirable to have a PTC resistor with a resistance of 4.5 ohms. (Paragraph 50).

11. In re Claim 8, Woo teaches that the circuit arrangement is designed to be used with a picture display device with a cathode ray tube (Paragraph 3).

12. In re Claim 9, Woo teaches that the switch is a relay (140) having a mains isolation with the control contacts being coupled to a microprocessor (130) for control by the microprocessor (paragraph 35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woo et al.
14. Woo discloses the claimed invention except for explicitly stating that the time interval for switch off takes place when the ampere-turns product is greater than 5. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to specify a time interval that allows for a ampere-turns product greater than 5 in order to prevent the PTC from overheating since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).
15. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woo et al in view of the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and Sakamaki et al.
16. In re Claims 5 and 6, Woo teaches that it is desirable for the degaussing coil to have a resistance of 17 ohms (Paragraph 50). Woo does not teach what material the coil is made of.
17. The AAPA teaches that it is known in the art to form the degaussing coil out of copper although it results in a heavy coil (Lines 8-19 of Page 3).
18. Sakamaki teaches that it is known to replace the copper in coils with aluminum in order to reduce the weight and bulk of the coil (Column 13 Lines 34-38).
19. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the degaussing coil of Woo with aluminum in order to reduce the weight and bulk of the coil.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER J. CLARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1427. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 10:00-6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Elms can be reached on 571-727-1869. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CJC
11/14/2008

/Stephen W Jackson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2836